

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004. Claims 1-71 remain pending in the Application. Claims 1-10, 12-17, 21-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-53, 55-62, 65, and 69 were rejected. Claims 11, 18-20, 32, 39-41, 44, and 54 were objected to. Claims 63-64, 66-68, and 70-71 were allowed. Claims 1, 21, 22, 42, 43, 53, 62, 65, 69, and 70 are being amended. Claim 16 is being canceled. Claims 1-15 and 17-71 will be pending in the application after entry of the Claim Listing above. No new matter is being introduced.

Claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-17, 21-31, 33-34, 36-38, 42-43, 45-51, 53, and 55-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullapalli (U.S. Patent 6,424,076) in view of Ben-Yaakov (WO 00/25368). Applicant is amending claim 1 to further define a switch in the electronics ("at least one switch defined by at least two selectively controllable solid state switches connected in series and operatively combining to provide a closed state and an open state for selectably enabling and disabling said at least one actuator to control the mechanical operation of the mirror"). Neither Gullapalli nor Ben-Yaakov, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests such a structure for selectably enabling an actuator to control mechanical operation of a mirror.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Because claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 21 depend from amended claim 1, these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 22, 42, 43, 53, and 62 are being amended to include limitations similar to those in amended claim 1. Therefore, these claims should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1.

Because claims 23-31, 33-34, 36-38, 45-51, and 55-61 depend from the now amended independent claims, these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claims 14, 35, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullapalli in view of Ben-Yaakov and further in view of Angelbeck et al. (U.S. Patent

Applicant : Solomon
Serial No. : 09/616,106
Filed : July 14, 2000
Page : 25 of 25

Applicant's Docket No.: SOL00-03
Amendment C

4,091,274). Because these claims depend from amended independent claims 1, 22, and 43, the dependent claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claims 58, 65, and 69, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are being amended to overcome the rejections. Applicant thanks Examiner for the suggestions.

Claim 70 is being amended to correct an antecedent basis problem.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in order for issuance. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/7/04

Mark B. Solomon
Mark B. Solomon

SolVisions Technologies Int'l
82 Albemarle Road
Norwood, MA 02062
Telephone: (617) 388-7825
Facsimile: (214) 526-0488